GPO 870-390

OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 039 389	AA 000 567		Jun 70	RIEOCT70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Blasingame, Ralph; Summers,F. William

TITLE
State and Regional Library Studies; A State of the Art Paper.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
BBB01045	

SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66004	

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;0.75	OEC-1-7-070866-4575	

REPORT NO.	BUREAU NO.
Review Series-3	BR-7-0866

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
13p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Regional Libraries; *State Libraries; *Library Surveys; *Questionnaires; *Library Planning; Library Associations

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT The studies examined were all issued since 1965, thus, this is not a historical study of progress (or decline) in methodology, idea development or the actual results ensuing from the study process but rather it is an attempt to aid in assessing such matters as the thoroughness and care with which state and regional library studies are now normally carried out. The ERIC bibliography "Library Surveys and Development Plans" (ED 031 609) was chosen as the data base for this study to insure recency, the ERIC list which covers the 1965-1969 period was chosen over several earlier lists covering larger time periods. Tables are given to present: (1) distribution of studies by year of publication, (2) distribution of studies by type of library, (3) distributuion of studies by library function, (4) distribution of studies by investigator, (5) distribution of sample by investigator as compared to the population and (6) comparison of sample and population distributions by type of library. Section IV presents a sequential resume of the analysis of the data in terms of the 16 questions against which the studies were examined. Appendix II is a complete tabulation of the questions. (NH)

ED 039 389

ERIC

Educational Resources Information Center

REVIEW SERIES NUMBER 3

STATE AND REGIONAL LIBRARY STUDIES

A STATE OF THE ART PAPER

ISLIC

Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences

AA 000 567

LIBRARY SCHOOL • UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REVIEW SERIES **NUMBER 3**

STATE AND REGIONAL LIBRARY STUDIES

A STATE OF THE ART PAPER

by

Ralph Blasingame
Professor

and

F. William Summers
Research Fellow

Graduate School of Library Service
Rutgers University

This document was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCES
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

JUNE, 1970

The ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences is a joint project of the Educational Resources Information Center of the U.S. Office of Education and the University of Minnesota Library School.

I. PURPOSE (AND LIMITATIONS)

This paper represents an effort to assess the state of the art in recent state and regional library studies. Clearly, as will be shown later, the rate of production of such studies has increased radically in the past five years. While no facts are available here as to the investment in library studies, it may be presumed from the increase in numbers that investment in the study process is substantial, as compared with the past. Questions arise, then, as to what the person or body commissioning a library study through the channels most often used may expect to result.

The studies examined here were all issued since 1965. This paper is, then, not a historical study of progress (or decline) in methodology, idea development or the actual results ensuing from the study process, though those are all interesting areas for investigation. Rather, as stated above, it is an attempt to aid in assessing such matters as the thoroughness and care with which state and regional library studies are now normally carried out.

II. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The ERIC bibliography *Library Surveys and Development Plans*[1] was chosen as the data base for this study. Since recency seemed an important criterion the ERIC list which covers the period 1965-1969 was chosen over several excellent earlier lists covering larger time periods. After excluding 10 national and 5 state level studies, which were parts of larger state studies, the remaining 89 studies constituted the population from which a random sample of size 15 was selected for further analysis and comment.

The population itself provides several opportunities for analysis based upon information contained in the bibliography. Table 1 indicates the distribution of the studies by year of publication.

Table 1

Distribution of Studies by Year of Publication*

YEAR OF PUBLICATION	NUMBER OF STUDIES	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1965	13	14.60
1966	17	19.10
1967	27	30.36
1968	26	29.21
1969	6**	6.74
TOTAL	89	100***

*Source: All tables presented here are drawn from the ERIC bibliography except where another source is given.

**This low figure is probably due to the cut-off date for the bibliography (Sept. 1969) rather than to a decrease in activity.

***Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

Considering that in many studies several years may elapse between the commissioning of a study and its actual publication it is difficult to generalize about the data in Table 1.

To determine the patterns of these studies over a larger period of time, an analysis of an earlier bibliography covering a broader time span was made. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2.

---

1. *Library Surveys and Development Plans: An Annotated Bibliography.* Minneapolis: ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences, September 1969. ED 031 609.

Table 2

Distribution of Studies by Year of Publication--1944-64*

YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDIES
1944	7
1945	1
1946	3
1947	6
1948	5
1949	3
1950	6
1951	4
1952	4
1953	3
1954	5
1955	1
1956	4
1957	1
1958	5
1959	3
1960	7
1961	5
1962	7
1963	10
1964	5
	95

*Source: Bunge, Charles A. "Statewide Public Library Surveys and Plans, 1944-60." **ALA Bulletin**, Volume 59, No. 5, May , 1965, pp. 364-374.

A comparison of Tables 1 and 2 clearly indicates that a significant increase in study activity occurred in the latter half of the 1960's. It is startling to realize that only six fewer studies were produced in the five-year period 1965-69 than were produced in the twenty-year period 1944-64. It is to be assumed that the increase is due in large part to increased funding, particularly at the state level, but this fact alone would not account for the production of such a radical increase in studies unless a concomitant increase in the values librarians attach to such studies had also occurred.

Sixty of the studies (two-thirds of the total) dealt with public libraries. The dominance of the public library as shown in Tables 3 and 4 is sufficiently great to raise the question of whether the library survey is a particularly valuable tool for public libraries, whether managers of other types of libraries have not yet seen the state or regional plan as a particularly valuable device, or whether the availability of funds is the principal reason for having studies carried out. It is not known from what source funds for the studies came. Experience suggests that LSCA provided the impetus for many public library state and regional studies. The relatively large number of institutional and inter-library cooperation studies (26) is probably due in large part to the recent availability of federal funds under Titles III and IV of LSCA. The small number of school and academic library studies, however, is somewhat surprising in view of the availability of funds from other federal programs.

Table 3

Distribution of Studies by Type of Library

LIBRARY TYPE	NUMBER OF STUDIES	PERCENT OF TOTAL
School Library	1	1.13
Statewide Public Library	37	41.57
Regional Public Library	23	25.84
Academic Library	2	2.24
Institutional Library	10	11.24
Inter-Library Cooperation	16	17.98
	89	100*

*Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

Table 4

Distribution of Studies by Library Function

LIBRARY FUNCTION	NUMBER OF STUDIES	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Statewide School Library Development	1	1.12
Statewide Public Library Development	25	28.09
Regional Public Library Development	17	19.10
Public Library Service to Special Communities or Groups	1	1.12
Statewide Inter-Library Cooperation	10	11.24
Regional Inter-Library Cooperation	5	5.62
Statewide Visually and/or Physically Handicapped	3	3.38
Statewide Public Library Book Processing	9	10.11
Statewide Academic Library Book Processing	1	1.12
Service to State Institutions	7	7.86
Statewide Audio-Visual Service	2	2.24
Statewide Inter-Library Loan Network	5	5.62
Statewide Academic Library Plan	2	2.24
Statewide Manpower Study	1	1.12
TOTAL	89	100.00*

*Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

As indicated in Table 5, clearly the individual investigators and the consulting firms were in the late 1960's the primary sources of library surveys accounting for almost 85% of the total activity. This finding is probably not very surprising but the low activity by state and regional planning agencies in the light of their growth in the last decade is surprising. Research which attempted to learn why individual researchers are so often favored and why consultant firms are strongly favored over state and regional planning groups might reveal much about the expectations with which librarians engage in the planning process.

It is also surprising in the light of continuing effort toward strengthening state libraries that these agencies have not produced more studies.

In order to examine the patterns by investigator over a larger period of time the Bunge bibliography was analyzed and compared to Table 5. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 5

Distribution of Studies by Investigator

INVESTIGATOR	NUMBER OF STUDIES	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Individual Investigators	48	53.93
Consultant Firm	27	30.34
State Library Agency	5	5.62
State Planning Agency	3	3.37
Regional Planning Group	3	3.37
State Library Association	2	2.24
Research Institute	1	1.12
TOTAL	89	100.00*

*Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

Table 6

Distribution of Studies by Investigator 1944-64*
Compared to 1965-69**

INVESTIGATOR	NUMBER 1944-64	% OF TOTAL	NUMBER 1965-69	% OF TOTAL
Individual Investigator	38	40.0	48	53.9
State Library Association	22	23.1	2	2.2
State Planning Agency	20	21.0	3	3.4
State Library Agency	12	12.6	5	5.6
Consultant Firm	1	1.0	27	30.3
Research Institute	1	1.0	1	1.0
Regional Planning Group	0	0	3	3.4
Other	1	1.0	0	0
TOTAL	95	100	89	100

*Source: Bunge, Charles A. "Statewide Public Library Surveys and Plans, 1944-64." **ALA Bulletin,** Volume 59, No. 5, May, 1965. pp. 364-374.

**Source: Table 5.

Certainly the most striking change is the significant increase in the use of consultant firms. The single entry in the Bunge list occurred in 1963, and by the end of the relatively short period 1965-69 these firms had conducted almost one-third of the studies. Any attempt to explain this phenomenon would be largely conjectural. Certainly the increased sums available might have been a factor, but again it must be observed that the discretion in spending those sums was largely in the hands of librarians. Of equal interest is the decline of state planning agencies and state library associations. In classifying the Bunge entries, studies by agencies such as Governor's Commissions, Library Study Commissions, Legislative Research Committees, and the like, were classed as studies conducted by state planning agencies. One question which immediately comes to mind is whether the decline in the use of state planning agencies indicates an increase in the alienation of libraries from the political planning processes of the state. One could hazard a guess that other activities of state and local government would not show a similar decrease over the same time period and that in fact an increase would be more likely.

It would also seem important to know the origin of such a shift, i.e., are state planning agencies less interested in library planning or have library agencies abandoned state planning agencies? In any event, the swing away from publicly supported planning agencies and toward management firms has coincided with an increase in development of state and regional planning offices, some of which are performing far more sophisticated planning than is apparent in the studies in this sample carried out by management firms or individual investigators.

The decline in activity by state library associations is perplexing. The recent history of the associations suggests that they are attempting to become more active and "professional" yet the data suggest a decline in a highly important area of activity.

Less dramatic but perhaps more significant is the decline of the state library agency as a producer of studies. If the decline in professional association activity were matched by an increase in state library activity it would be possible to suggest that the planning process was shifting to an agency whose capability had increased. This is obviously not the case and in fact it appears that both professional groups are entrusting the planning process to others.

As was suggested earlier, the decline in activity by state library agencies is especially puzzling in light of the widespread discussion about the increased importance of these agencies in the area of long-range planning.

III. COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

In general the random sample (See Appendix I for studies in the sample) conforms reasonably well to the population, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Distribution of Sample by Investigator
as Compared to the Population

INVESTIGATOR	NO. OF STUDIES IN SAMPLE	PERCENT OF SAMPLE	PERCENT OF POPULATION (Table 5)
Individual Investigator	7	46.66	53.93
State Library Agency	1	6.66	5.62
Regional Planning Group	0	0	3.37
Consultant Firm	6	40.0	30.34
Research Institute	0	0	1.12
State Library Association	1	6.66	2.24
State Planning Agency	0	0	3.37
TOTAL	15	100*	100*

*Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

Of the seven categories, three -- state library agencies, consultant firms and state library associations -- are over-represented, and four categories -- individual investigators, regional planning groups, research institutes and state planning agencies -- are under-represented.

The sample size of fifteen was chosen arbitrarily. It represents about 17% of the population and provides sufficient diversity to satisfy the purposes of this paper; that is, to represent the *normal* state of the art. Had it been the purpose of this paper to identify the "best" of the art or to suggest a study outline which future investigators might follow, a different group of studies chosen by a different method might have been selected for analysis.

Table 8

Comparison of Sample and Population Distributions
by Type of Library

TYPE OF LIBRARY	NUMBER IN SAMPLE	PERCENT OF SAMPLE	PERCENT OF POPULATION
School Library	1	6.66	1.13
Statewide Public Library	6	40.00	41.57
Regional Public Library	3	20.00	25.84
Academic Library	0	0	2.24
Institutional Library	3	20.00	11.24
Inter-Library Cooperation	2	13.33	17.98
		100*	100*

*Will not add to 100% because of rounding.

Considering the small numbers involved it is felt that the sample is a satisfactory replica of the population and that it is possible to generalize from the analysis of the sample to the population with accuracy.

IV ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE

This section will present a sequential resume of the analysis of the data in terms of the sixteen questions against which the studies were examined. A complete tabulation of the questions will be found in Appendix II.

1 Was the Questionnaire Used to Collect Data Printed in the Report?

Questionnaires were used in ten of the studies in the sample and the complete questionnaire was reproduced in eight of these studies. Where complete data are reported a high percentage of returns is the rule, commonly 70% or more and in some cases over 95%. In most cases the questionnaires were especially developed for the study. In the cases which do not give complete data it is frequently not possible to determine the percentage of response or how many usable responses were received.

2. Was a Full Report of the Responses to the Questionnaires Provided?

In eight of the ten studies which used questionnaires the report included a full presentation of the responses to the questionnaire. The presentation of these data is vital to any evaluation of the studies and any attempts to replicate the results.

3 Were Field Interviews Used?

Field visits of some kind were used in two-thirds of the studies. In almost every case the data about field interviews are stated very generally in terms such as "interviewed staff members of selected companies," or "several representatives of the community were interviewed." When numbers of individuals interviewed are stated there is no indication what proportion of the total population this number represents and it is frequently difficult to tell this from the report. It is the rare case when complete data on the field interviews are presented. Generally interview schedules are not included in the reports although in some cases statistical data from interviews are used in the body of the report. Of course, many interviews are unstructured and it is possible that surveyors tend to rely on that type because it does have certain advantages. However, where schedules are used and where complete tabulations or responses are given the credence to be given to any report on a study is increased.

4. Are Tabulations of Statistics Used?

Almost three-quarters (73%) of the studies included some kind of statistical tabulation. These were in the form of complete statistical appendices based upon questionnaire responses, presentation of selected questionnaire responses at appropriate places in the text, or tabulations of statistics gathered for other purposes, e.g., reports to state library agencies, census reports and the like. Among the studies presenting statistical data the most common form of presentation is the first named. Selected data from this tabulation were usually also commented upon in the body of the report. It should be remembered that in only eight of the fifteen studies analyzed were questionnaires and full tabulations presented for inspection.

5. Is a Statement of the Purpose of the Study Presented?

With but one exception the studies included some statement of purpose or a statement of the questions which the study was designed to answer. In most cases the purpose was very generally stated in terms such as, "the essential purpose of the study was to survey the resources of libraries in the state and to make recommendations for improvement of library service."

In only one case was there the carefully detailed and explicit problem statement one might expect to be associated with research efforts. No pattern could be found in terms of investigators, i.e., the statements by individual investigators were not consistently more or less specific than those done by consultant firms or by the other types of investigators.

6. Was Information Obtained Directly from Users?

In only four studies was there an effort to obtain data directly from users of libraries. In two of the cases the data were gathered by interviews and in two cases certain groups of users were sent questionnaires. In the four studies collecting user data, two were conducted by consultant firms and two by individual

investigators. In one case the amount of user data was quite limited; in that instance (a study of a large urban area) only 91 users were interviewed.

In general, the persons conducting the studies in this sample, then, relied upon reports from the libraries concerned on number and characteristics of users, despite the acknowledged limitations of such information.

7. Does the Study Accept Current Professional Premises?

The studies were examined to determine the degree to which professional premises as embodied in standards and long-standing professional suppositions were accepted. All of the studies, with one exception in which this question was not appropriate, were found to accept such criteria without effort at independent verification.

To a very significant degree the recommendations of these studies depend upon the validity of professional standards and other assumptions. It was thought that perhaps the consultant firms would behave differently in this regard than the individual researchers but this did not prove to be the case.

This finding also suggests that these studies are not adding to professional knowledge but merely are applying and reiterating that which is already "known" or assumed to be known.

It is recognized that judgments of whether or not a study does or does not accept professional premises is largely subjective. The only defense which the present investigators have for their judgments is that they would have welcomed and given "credit" for almost any unfamiliar premise.

8. Do the Studies Utilize Inferential Statistical Methods?

This question sought to judge whether or not the studies used inferential statistical methods or relied solely upon presentation of the data in descriptive form. Only three of the studies (20%) used statistical methods which were inferential. In only one case were methods used which permitted testing the degree to which a sample represented the population from which it was drawn.

Most commonly the raw answers to questionnaires were simply totaled and reported or, at most grouped by frequency distributions. In some cases percentages or measures of central tendency were used. Apparently the well established techniques of inferential statistics have made virtually no impact upon library studies of this type.

9. Do the Studies Cite Pertinent Research Literature?

All of the studies failed to cite pertinent research literature. Predominantly the items cited were A.L.A. standards and national, state and local publications of demographic data. The authors of these studies failed to include the results of the limited research effort which the profession has mounted to date.

10. Do the Investigators Make Contact with Non-Library Groups and Organizations?

Another way in which an investigator can obtain new viewpoints and ideas is through contact with groups and organizations outside the field of librarianship. Such contact helps to insure that the investigator sees the problem from viewpoints other than that of the professionals involved. In four of the studies in this sample there was evidence that some special groups or organizations other than those which were library-centered were contacted. The outsiders most often contacted were elected and appointed officials including state, regional and local planning officials.

11. Do the Recommendations Fall Into a Recognizable Pattern?

This analysis dealt with the question of whether or not the recommendations fall into an established pattern of library direction, e.g., calling for the establishment of larger units of systems, centralization of activities and similar concerns.

In only three studies did the recommendations involve departing from commonly accepted norms. The

fact that none of the studies by individual investigators showed this characteristic perhaps indicates widespread acceptance of the status quo. This finding is, of course, consistent with the failure to cite research literature (Question No.9).

Overall, the analysis suggests that studies of this type will rarely be the vehicle for breaking new ground or for challenging well established practices and assumptions. It also suggests that if the objective of a study is to obtain new ideas the library survey is not normally the most desirable vehicle.

12. Do the Studies Suggest or Comment About Objectives for the Institutions Involved in the Study?

One possible value of a survey is the opportunity to assess the objectives of the institutions in the light of findings. The studies in this sample were analyzed to determine the degree to which suggestions about objectives were made. In the fourteen studies to which this analysis was applicable only two (14%) made comments or suggestions about the appropriateness of the objectives the institutions were pursuing. In the other twelve studies, no statements about the objectives of the institutions being studied were made.

This failure to assess basic objectives is perhaps the most serious shortcoming of the surveys. It might be supposed that most of the failures which the surveys seek to remedy flow from a lack of focus on basic objectives.

13. Were Non-Librarian Specialists Employed?

Except for studies by consultant firms, in only one case was there evidence of the use of non-librarian specialists in conducting the study. In the case of the consultant firms it was assumed that the staffs were predominantly non-librarians and indeed that this may be one of the factors leading to the utilization of such firms.

The failure to employ specialists in such important fields as statistics, sociology and political science probably contributes to many of the faults cited in this commentary.

14. Do the Studies Attempt to Analyze Library Resources (i.e. materials) or Do They Accept Statistical Data as Reported?

In only two cases was an effort made to obtain qualitative empirical data about the resources of libraries. Admittedly such data are difficult and costly to obtain but they are also important in assessing capabilities of libraries to respond to user needs. In general, considerable emphasis has been placed on availability of resources in library system planning, so this was thought to be a key issue.

15. Do the Studies Recommend Additional Studies?

This analysis does provide a challenge to the myth that surveys always suggest additional surveys. Only three of the studies (20%) recommend additional study, and in these cases the recommendation is for general analysis rather than a specific problem to be studied.

16. Do the Studies Provide for Up-Dating the Plans?

Only four of the studies (26.6%) contain recommendations or provisions for up-dating the study. In the light of the fact that studies of this type are generally expensive this must be considered a serious omission. This failure may be related to the failure to recommend additional studies as noted above. One could speculate, of course, that failure to provide mechanisms for up-dating the plans growing out of these studies creates a future need for additional studies.

V. COMMENT

All but one of the study reports analyzed for this paper were planning documents. That is, the end result of the study was a plan of "library improvement." The exception was set forth as a compilation of data for future planning purposes (incidentally, it was by far the most carefully prepared). We have moved far from the position commonly held thirty to forty years ago that planning in the public interest was a variety of socialism to be abhorred. The art of planning in the public interest has also developed rapidly, especially in the past ten to fifteen years, evolving from primarily land-use, one-shot planning to social planning, a process to be carried out continuously.

Donald Webster defined planning as follows:

> Planning is the process which looks to the future for the purpose of influencing the well-being of the people . . . Planning is essentially a process of understanding human needs and of influencing and shaping future public policy to serve those needs most effectively . . . As a process, it is concerned with research, with prophecy and with value judgments.[1]

The study reports analyzed for this paper are seriously deficient as planning documents, if Webster's definition of planning is accepted. For example, the failure to identify future studies to be perfomed together with the failure to suggest means for keeping the documents/plans up to date clearly labels these as one-shot efforts. By neglecting to incorporate information about short- and long-term consequences of urbanization, economic growth and other factors which will obviously influence the future, these reports do not look to the future. Only if virtually all of the assumptions of librarians about how libraries ought to be run and what is good for people are accepted, can these documents be given credit for understanding human needs or for serving needs more effectively. As to a concern with research, these studies were neither carefully designed from a research point of view, with an occasional exception, nor did they take into consideration the wealth of knowledge about human conduct or the factual knowledge of librarianship which is available. To say that they treat prophecy lightly is to compliment them, again with an occasional exception. The value judgments used in them are, almost without exception, those made long ago by librarians.

Limited methodology and casual data gathering are in one sense the most severe limitations of the study reports analyzed. It is likely, however, that these problems flow from the general tendency not to define the purpose of the study itself clearly or to identify the objectives of the institutions studied. If neither the investigator (or study team) nor the commissioners of the study knows in what directions the study should move, (if both are without clear objectives, in other words), almost any methodology can be made to seem adequate. Where one should assign responsibility for this lack of definition of goals is not entirely clear. It is to be supposed that neither the persons or groups commissioning or performing the studies are neophytes, devoid of expectations and skills. Neither, as noted above, is society without persons who have formulated rather clear definitions of the planning process.

Will the state of the art of state and regional library studies be improved? Not so long as persons untrained in identification of problems, objective study and the planning process either commission or perform studies. Such persons, one might suppose, may regard these processes as arcane and threatening; activities which may disturb the status quo and suggest grey areas in which known administrative methods and assumptions will not suffice. It is perhaps unkind and inaccurate to suggest that the present state of the art provides a facade of objectivity and expertise while not presenting facts or conclusions which are disturbing. The consistency of the findings of this brief paper, however, lead one in this direction.

Perhaps this paper should end on a more optimistic note. It can be taken as an encouraging sign that an increasing investment is being made in planning. Perhaps we shall have to go through a period (along with other institutions) in which we will discover that the study route is not the best one if we want new insights and if we want to adjust to a changing society.

---

1. Webster, Donald H. Urban Planning and Municipal Policy. New York: Harper, 1958. p.4.

APPENDIX I

Studies Included in the Sample

1. Duchac, Kenneth F. A Library Service Center for Suburban Maryland County Library Systems, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Montgomery, Prince George's; An Establishment Proposal. 1968. 68p. ED 023 437.

2. Guthrie, Melvin Glenn. A Study of Conditions and Services in School Libraries in the State of Arizona. A Supplementary Report of the Arizona Library Survey. Tempe: Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Services, January 1968. 224p. ED 024 411.

3. Hamill, Harold. Community Facilities Study. Volume 1, Libraries. Tennessee: Memphis and Shelby County Planning Commission, November 1967. 127p. Available from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151 as PB 179 473.

4. Indiana State Library, Indianapolis. Survey of Indiana Correctional Institution Libraries. August 1966. 49p. ED 025 278.

5. Kantor, David. A Survey of Libraries and Library Services in the State Institutions of Florida. Tallahassee: Florida State Library, 1967. 85p. ED 021 586.

6. Little (Arthur D.) Inc., Boston. The 3R's Program -- Meeting Industry's Information Needs. Report to the Division of Library Development, New York State Library. September 1967. 78p. ED 022 500.

7. Management Services Associates, Inc., Austin. A Survey of Texas Public Libraries, 1965. August 1966. 119p. ED 027 046.

8. Marvin, James C. A Plan for Library Cooperation in Missoula County, Montana. Helena: Montana State Library, 1968. 30p. ED 024 417.

9., Maryland Library Association. Survey of Maryland Adult Correctional Institution Libraries. August 1965. 61p. ED 025 291.

10. Nelson Associates, Inc., New York. Basic Problems and Possibilities for a Reference and Research Library Resources System in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, New York. April 1965. 49p. ED 023 426.

11. Nelson Associates, Inc., New York. Feasibility of School and College Library Processing Through Public Library Systems in New York State. A Report for the New York State Library. March 1966. 60p. ED 021 511.

12. Nelson Associates, Inc., New York. Library Service in the Yakima Valley and Adjacent Regions; A Survey with Recommendations. June 1967. 125p. ED 021 570.

13. Nelson Associates, Inc., New York. New Directions in Library Service for Colorado, Report of a Survey Undertaken for the Colorado State Library. August 1965. 99p. ED 020 746.

14. Swank, R. C. Library Service for the Visually and Physically Handicapped; A Report to the Calfornia State Library. 1967. 87p. ED 024 426.

15. Vann, Sarah K. Southeastern Pennsylvania Processing Center Feasibility Study. Final Report. Pennsylvania State Library Monograph No. 4. 1967. 288p. ED 017 280.

APPENDIX II
Results of Analysis of Sample

	QUESTION	YES	NO
1.	Was the questionnaire used to collect data printed in the report?	8	2
2.	Was a full report of the responses to the questionnaire provided?	8	2
3.	Were field interviews used?	10	5
4.	Are tabulations of statistics used?	11	4
5.	Is a statement of the purpose of the study presented?	14	1
6.	Was information obtained directly from users?	4	8
7.	Does the study accept current professional premises?	14	0
8.	Do the studies utilize inferential statistical methods?	3	12
9.	Do the studies cite pertinent research literature?	0	15
10.	Do the investigators make contact with non-library groups and organizations?	4	11
11.	Do the recommendations fall into a recognizable pattern?	12	3
12.	Do the studies suggest or comment about objectives for the institutions involved in the study?	2	12
13.	Were non-librarian specialists employed?	7	8
14.	Do the studies attempt to analyze library resources (*ie.* materials) or do they accept statistical data as reported?	ANALYZE 2	ACCEPT REPORTS 13
15.	Do the studies recommend additional studies?	3	12
16.	Do the studies provide for up-dating the plans?	4	11